

YANO et al  
Appl. No. 10/750,957  
Response to Office Action dated August 10, 2005

### REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject patent application are respectfully requested.

The specification has been amended to correct minor informalities. Entry of these amendments to the specification is respectfully requested.

Claims 5-8 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and thus the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph, is moot.

Claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102 (e) as allegedly being "anticipated" by Norimoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,820,001). While not acquiescing in this rejection, claims 1-3 and 9-12 have been amended and, as noted above, claims 5-8 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. As such, the discussion below makes reference to the amended claims.

Claim 1 is directed to a navigation apparatus that includes a transfer device for transferring map data used for route guidance. The transferred map data has a geographical range, and the geographical range of the map data surrounding a predetermined point on the set route is wider than the geographical range of the map data surrounding another point on the set route. By way of example without limitation, the subject patent application describes that the geographical range of the transferred map data surrounding a destination or a current position of a moving body may be wider than the geographical range of the transferred map data surrounding another point on the set route (e.g., by increasing number of the transferred block map data surrounding the destination and the current position). See, e.g., step S13 in Figure 10 of the subject patent application and the accompanying description.

Norimoto does not disclose that a geographical range of the transferred map data surrounding a predetermined point on a set route should be wider than the geographical range of the transferred map data surrounding another point on the set route. In Norimoto, map data for route guidance is set based on the type of road and a geographical range of the transferred map data surrounding a "general road" is wider than the geographical range of the transferred map data surrounding a "throughway". See, e.g., steps ST2, ST3 and ST6 in Fig. 3 of Norimoto and col. 9, line 20 et seq. ("... That is, a range of a map area for the route link Lk of the throughway section is narrower than a range of a map area for the route link Lk of the general road section

YANO et al  
Appl. No. 10/750,957  
Response to Office Action dated August 10, 2005

..."). Consequently, the geographical range of transferred map data in Norimoto is not determined based on a predetermined point on the set route. Instead, the range is determined based on road type.

Because Norimoto does not disclose the concept of the geographical range of map data surrounding a predetermined point on the set route being wider than the geographical range of the map data surrounding another point on the set route, Norimoto does not anticipate claim 1 or claims 2 and 3 which depend therefrom.

Independent claims 9 and 11 similarly call for the geographical range of map data surrounding a predetermined point on the set route to be wider than the geographical range of the map data surrounding another point on the set route. As such, Norimoto does not anticipate these claims or the claims that depend therefrom.

New claims 13-23 have been added. The subject matter of these new claims is fully supported by the original disclosure and no new matter is added.

Claims 13 and 14 depend from claims 9 and 11, respectively. These claims are believed to be allowable because of these dependencies and because of the additional patentable features contained therein.

Claims 15-23 relate to a navigation apparatus that interrupts transferring and then transfers set map data after the interrupting, or that resets a route based on already transferred map data. Norimoto does not disclose a navigation apparatus that interrupts transferring and transfers set block map data after the interrupting, or that resets a route based on already transferred map data. Consequently, claims 15-23 are believed to be allowable over Norimoto.

YANO et al  
Appl. No. 10/750,957  
Response to Office Action dated August 10, 2005

The pending claims are believed to be allowable and favorable office action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By:



Michael J. Shea  
Reg. No. 34,725

MJS:mjs  
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203-1808  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100